

REMARKS

Claims 88-124 were pending in the application at the time the present Office Action was mailed. Claim 122 has been amended to clarify certain features of this claim. Accordingly, claims 88-124 remain pending in the application.

In the Office Action mailed January 21, 2005, claims 88-124 were rejected. More specifically, the status of the application in light of this Office Action is as follows:

(A) Claims 122 and 123 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,300,782 to Hembree et al. ("Hembree");

(B) Claims 88-97, 99-120, and 124 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hembree as applied to claim 122, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,277,660 to Zakel et al. ("Zakel"); and

(C) Claims 98 and 121 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hembree in view of Zakel as applied to claims 88 and 116, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,682,948 to Wada ("Wada").

The undersigned attorney wishes to thank the Examiner for engaging in a telephone interview on April 8, 2005 to discuss the present Office Action, the Hembree reference, and the pending claims. The following remarks summarize and expand upon the results of the interview, and they also reflect the agreements reached between the undersigned attorney and the Examiner during the interview. For example, the following remarks reflect the Examiner's acknowledgment that Hembree cannot support a rejection of independent claims 88, 106, 112, 116, and 122, and claims depending therefrom.

A. Response to the Section 102 Rejection of Claims 122 and 123

Claims 122 and 123 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Hembree. During the April 8 interview, the Examiner agreed that a proposed amendment to claim 122 patentably distinguishes claim 122 over Hembree.

Claim 122 has been amended accordingly. Therefore, the Section 102 rejection of claim 122 should be withdrawn.

Claim 123 depends from base claim 122. As discussed above, claim 122 is allowable. Therefore, claim 123 is now allowable as depending from claim 122, and also because of the additional features of this dependent claim. Accordingly, the Section 102 rejection of claim 123 should be withdrawn.

B. Response to the Section 103 Rejection of Claims 88-97, 99-120, and 124

Claims 88-97, 99-120, and 124 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hembree in view of Zakel. The Examiner acknowledged during the April 8 interview that Hembree and Zakel cannot support a Section 103 rejection of independent claim 88. Therefore, the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn.

Claims 89-97 and 99-105 depend from base claim 88. As discussed above, claim 88 is allowable. Therefore, claims 89-97 and 99-105 are allowable as depending from claim 88, and also because of the additional features of these dependent claims. Accordingly, the Section 103 rejection of claims 89-97 and 99-105 should be withdrawn.

Independent claims 106 and 112 include several features generally similar to claim 88 (e.g., a connection structure configured to remain decoupled from the microelectronic substrate). Accordingly, claims 106 and 112 are allowable over Hembree and Zakel for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 88, and for the additional features of these claims. Furthermore, during the April 8 interview the Examiner agreed that Hembree and Zakel cannot support a rejection of independent claims 106 and 112. Therefore, the Section 103 rejection of claims 106 and 112 should be withdrawn.

Claims 107-111 depend from base claim 106 and claims 113-115 depend from base claim 112. As discussed above, claims 106 and 112 are allowable. Therefore, claims 107-111 and 113-115 are allowable as depending from corresponding base claims 106 and 112, and also because of the additional features of these dependent

claims. Accordingly, the Section 103 rejection of claims 107-111 and 113-115 should be withdrawn.

As mentioned above, the Examiner acknowledged during the April 8 interview that Hembree and Zakel cannot support a Section 103 rejection of independent claim 116. Therefore, the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn.

Claims 117-120 depend from base claim 116. As discussed above, claim 116 is allowable. Therefore, claims 117-120 are allowable as depending from base claim 116, and also because of the additional features of these dependent claims. Accordingly, the Section 103 rejection of claim 117-120 should be withdrawn.

Claim 124 depends from base claim 122. As discussed previously, the Examiner acknowledged that Hembree fails to disclose or suggest the features of claim 122. Zakel fails to fill the voids of Hembree to support a Section 103 rejection of claim 122. Accordingly, dependent claim 124 is allowable over Hembree and Zakel for at least the reason that these references, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the features of claim 122 and the additional features of claim 124. Therefore, the Section 103 rejection of claim 124 should be withdrawn.

C. Response to the Section 103 Rejection of Claims 98 and 121

Claims 98 and 121 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hembree in view of Zakel, and in further view of Wada. Claim 98 depends from base claim 88 and claim 121 depends from base claim 116. As discussed above, the Examiner acknowledged that Hembree and Zakel fail to disclose or suggest the features of claims 88 and 121. Wada fails to fill the voids of Hembree and Zakel to support a Section 103 rejection of claims 88 and 116. Accordingly, dependent claims 98 and 121 are allowable over Hembree, Zakel, and Wada for at least the reason that these references, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the features of claims 88 and 116 and the additional features of claims 98 and 121. Therefore, the Section 103 rejection of claims 98 and 121 should be withdrawn.

D. Additional Matters

In an IDS submitted on February 10, 2004 (and considered by the Examiner on January 7, 2005), there was no indication that the Fujitsu Ltd. reference (European Patent No. 853,337) was considered. Applicants respectfully request confirmation that this reference was in fact considered by the Examiner.


Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the pending claims comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112 and are patentable over the applied art. The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application and a mailing of a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-3982.

Respectfully submitted,

Perkins Coie LLP

Date: 4/21/05



Aaron J. Poledna
Registration No. 54,675

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. 25096
Perkins Coie LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8000